

The applicants do not expel any molten metal and do not focus their laser beam into the object so as to melt and/or vaporize the sheet being cut. Accordingly, applicants respectfully traverse the alleged teaching of the re-  
5 ject claims on Kobsa.

The preamble of amended Claim 1 calls for marking visible surface deformation on the surface of a multi-layered workpiece. The Kobsa reference is not capable of marking a surface of a multi-layered workpiece and only  
10 teaches cutting thin sheets!

Applicants and Kobsa both employ laser generators, attenuators, expanders and collimators, however, the collimated spot of applicants' system is used for marking. Kobsa's beam melts, cuts and removes metal above and below  
15 his beam!

Claim 1 calls for a "collimated conditioned marking beam." Kobsa does not teach a marking beam and focuses his collimated beam into a workpiece.

Claim 1 calls for a "beam steerer for directing  
20 and focusing said marking beam onto a surface of said multi-layered workpiece," etc. Kobsa has no teaching which responds to any part of element (e) of Claim 1.

Claim 1 calls for a material handler. Kobsa has an X-Y table, not a material handler.

25 In summary, Kobsa clearly does not teach four of the elements and the mode of operation set forth in Claim 1 and is not capable of marking any layer, let alone a carbon layer, without removing metal from the workpiece! Claims 2 to 13 are dependent from allowable Claim 1 and provide distinctions not found in Kobsa or the cited secondary refer-  
30 ences.



-6-

Claims 3, 4 and 6 to 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103 on the principal reference Kobsa in view of Johnson et al. '654 or Stovell et al. '939 or Maruyama '651. All of the secondary references cut or remove material. Johnson et al. trims thin film resistors. Stovall et al. engraves (i.e. cuts) engraving cylinders. Maruyama's apparatus machines workpieces with a cutting beam. Each of the secondary references employ a complex series of elements to create a focused beam and/or a polarized light beam. None of the secondary references teach or suggest that they may be combined with Kobsa. Therefore, the rejection based on combined references is a hindsight rejection in which parts and elements of the references are selected using applicants' claims as a guide or list. When parts of these references are inserted into Johnson, the references become inoperable. Clearly the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Applicants will submit new formal drawings when the claim or claims are allowed.

Claims 46 to 51 are added to more clearly distinguish over the cited references.

Amended Claims 1 to 13 and new claims 46 to 51 are now in this application in allowable form which distinguishes over the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is requested.

A petition for an extension of time is attached.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on 8 AUGUST 2001

(Date of Deposit)

JOHN B. SOWELL - ATTY

(Name of Applicant, Assignee, or Registered Representative)

John B. Sowell  
Signature

8 AUGUST 2001

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Sowell  
John B. Sowell - Attorney  
Registration No. 19,151

RECEIVED  
AUG 14 2001  
5 1700 MAIL ROOM